DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 132 HE 011 534

AUTHOR Philippi, Harlan A.

TITLE A Deans' Response to a Review of Procedures & Policies Governing Appointment, Promotion & Tenure in New England Institutions of Higher Education.

INSTITUTION New England Teacher Corps Network, Portsmouth, N.H.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM New England Teacher Corps Network, P.O. Box 1065, Portsmouth, NH 03801

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Arbitration; *College Faculty; Efficiency; Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Performance Contracts; Personnel Policy; Reduction in Force; Standards; Teacher Dismissal; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

Statements and documents concerning the criteria and standards used for faculty promotion, retention, and tenure in member institutions were collected by the Deans' Council of the New England Teacher Corps Network. The response presented in this publication is made in the form of a memo to the faculty senate, from the dean of a college or education. It is concluded that as more uniformity in policies, more precision in statements of criteria and standards, and more regulation of practices are sought, there will be a gain in an important efficiency index and in institutional definitions of fairness. However, there is a consequent risk of diminished adaptiveness. In the extreme, both positions are seen as damaging, and are cautioned against. It is suggested that a Professional Equity Compact be used by institutions as a tool for equity in faculty personnel matters. Such a formal document is proposed and would contain a statement of rights, responsibilities, privileges, obligations, objectives, focused interests, and whatever other referents are thought to be important to the individual and the institution for evaluation purposes for a specific period of time. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

New England Teacher Corps Network
Connecticut • Maine • Massachusetts • New Hampshire • Rhode Island • Vermont

ED174132

A DEANS' RESPONSE TO A REVIEW OF PROCEDURES & POLICIES GOVERNING APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION & TENURE IN NEW ENGLAND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
New England Teacher Corps Network
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Harlan A. Philippi

University of Southern Maine

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE011534

May, 1979

Post Office Box 1065 · Portsmouth, N.H. 03801 · 603·431·1422

NEW ENGLAND TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

DEANS' COUNCIL

1978 - 1979

Barbara Brittingham, University of Rhode Island
Robert Cobb, University of Maine (Orono)
Ross Fearon, University of Maine (Farmington)
Roland Goddu, Northeastern University
James Jones, Boston State College
Roland Kimball, University of New Hampshire
Elizabeth Ann Liddle, Wheelock College
Mark Shibles, Jr., University of Connecticut
Irving Starr, University of Hartford
Charles Tesconi, University of Vermont
Sara R. Massey, Executive Secretary
New England Teacher Corps Network

Preface:

The Deans' Council of the New England Teacher Corps Network approved the collection of statements and documents concerning the criteria and standards used for faculty promotion, retention, and tenure (PRT) from the ten cooperating institutions of higher education. The information was received by the author, Harlan Philippi, of the document which follows.

The author has choosen to write his response to this collection in the form of a "Memo to the Faculty Senate". The "Memo of Concern" and the examples quoted are drawn from the institutional data Dean Philippi reviewed. He then proceeds to offer suggestions about what could be done to improve the present state of affairs regarding procedures and policies for promotion, retention, and tenure. In the conclusion, he provides substantive suggestions for a new direction if deans and faculty want to change what we do rather than try to make better what we've done in the past.

In essence, this document provides some ideas and thoughts for deans and faculty to consider when they review their existing policies for PRT. It is anticipated that the Deans' Council of the New England Teacher Corps Network will review and discuss the concepts in this document when they convene in the fall, 1979.

TO: The Faculty Senate
FR: The Dean, College of Education
RE: Procedures and Policies Governing Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

In its "Memo of Concern" the Faculty Senate requested the Deans of the separate colleges to respond to the problems and issues regarding practices, procedures and policies for appointment, promotion and tenure given in its memo. It is not clear whether the Senate intended that the Deans respond individually or as a body. I have chosen to respond as an individual Dean, leaving to another time the possibility of a combined Deans' response.

Having decided to make an individual response, I immediately regret doing so. For one thing, I would prefer the comfort of a group response. For another, I must address the Senate's issues (the "other guy's" curriculum) even though the textual reality of those issues is not the reality I believe is of most importance to the educational health of the faculty or the institution.

At the outset I want to dismiss some of the Senate's concerns as being unworthy of more than a passing reference. Perhaps dismiss is too strong a word and I mean no discourtesy in my use of it. Some members of the Senate thought enough of these issues to include them among the Senate's concerns. But in the full range of personnel issues pressing upon the individual and the institution, these are the most pale. While they are real enough, no doubt (real in the sense that if I believe something to be true, it is real for me) I believe they are misrepresented.

For example: The Senate memo makes the point that in general deans have not been faithful to the "intentions" of personnel policies. I do not know if I am one of these "unfaithful" deans, but more than likely I have violated some rule or procedure or "intention" since coming to this College. Frankly, if I have committed such violations (and I don't own up to it, mind you) it is because of my inability to keep before me the minutia that is hung-through such policies and procedures like garish bangles. In my darkest moments I am convinced our procedures and policies were designed to be violated.

A second example: The Senate, rightfully for this institution in my judgment, seeks to elevate the preeminence of teaching by seeking to make it "the principal-judged activity for purposes of promotion and tenure." At the same time the Senate seeks to neutralize the use of student questionnaire evaluations. What a strange companion to determining preeminence.

A final example: The Senate recommends that "reviewing officers" should concur with departmental judgments, except for compelling reasons stated in detail. This proposed revision claims much more than it has a right to claim for a department. Faculty are members of a school or college (or other subunit) and members of the University. To propose that the judgments of one segment of the University are to be inviolate except for compelling reasons is at least a very narrow view if not an altogether arrogant one. While I do not argue against the need for compelling reasons, it is curious that the Senate's memo makes no mention of such reasons forming the substance of a department's collective judgment.

I should be more angry than I am. That I am not is of little credit to me coming as it does from a reluctant recognition that we have all become a little perverse, unsettled, mean and anxious in our present time. I am also aware that a formula approach to almost anything is always humanly attractive since it protects us from the onslaughts of conscious judgment. So, I am not angry.

I am embarrassed. We have become so willing to let rules and procedures stand in for our own professional judgment that we are no longer sure what we have gained or lost. In the Preamble to our personnel policies, for example, we state: "None of these criteria is intended to prevent the appointment or promotion of the rare exceptional individual who possesses unusual talents of a high order." If we do not seek to appoint and promote exceptional individuals, but hope only to prevent their being prejudiced against by our own criteria, we will never have to face that potential prejudice. Our criteria will only attract and encourage something less than exceptional and of a lower-order talent. Our standards and our procedures will reflect this loss of a sacral image condemned to the leveling of the least talented we can entice to join us and remain with us.

It should be evident I have little sympathy with these concerns of the Senate. I do assume, however, that some members of the Senate expect more than an unsympathetic response to their concerns even from an administrator. "Don't you have an obligation to present alternate proposals?" they may well ask. In reply I am reminded of a conference that supposedly took place in New York City. (The whole story may be apocryphal.) A well-known professor read a paper to a gathered audience and, when he finished, was challenged by an equally well-known professor who proceeded to refute the main points of the paper to such an extent that the paper's author pleaded: "Don't you have a responsibility to present your own position in addition to refuting mine?" The second professor replied: "When Hercules cleaned out the Aegean stables, he wasn't required to replace the dung."

There is no obligation upon the critic that extends beyond the integrity of the criticism, certainly no obligation to present alternate proposals. I will do so, however, because I am not all that certain this abstract principle can remain alive in a University society where a fair exchange is expected if seldom given. I begin with some comments on the present state of our affairs.

Ensconced In a Citadel

In a Preface to Morals, Lippman wrote that when we believe events are determined by votes of majority, orders of bosses, the opinions of neighbors (colleagues), the decisions of selfish men, we yield because we have to yield. We are conquered but unconvinced.

In Mother Night, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., wrote: "We are what we pretend to be, so we must be careful about what we pretend to be." These two points of view, I believe, fairly describe the present state of determining how the contributions of an individual to the lives of others through a university role can be appropriately assessed. We yield to the best advertised notion pretending it is eugenic and self-sufficient, and discover we have been so careless of what we pretended to be we have substituted pretense for style and thoughtless process for substance.

This is a harsh judgment, more harsh perhaps because we are reasonably intelligent, well-intentioned, "good" people. We did not set out to make poorly-conceived cookbooks of our personnel policies. We never deliberately started out to be wrong. We simply got caught looking the other way. It seemed incredible to us that anyone could have believed the old fable of university life. It was a new era of growth and change, of new markets for faculty and programs and for reaching beyond walls of dust humped up during another time. Our restless movement had purpose and there was always room to move, rank to rank, institution to institution. Ambiguity became our criteria, a second opinion our process, time in place our fleeting standard, grievance procedures our Bible and institutional inattention our professional hallmark. We spoke of ethical and moral "equivalents."

And now we are ensconced in this citadel with little room for movement -- opportunity, salary, rank or tenure. Not by design, mind you, but by a preoccupation with support for ourselves without reference to what our "selves" could do to better the educational lives of people everywhere. Real corruption (I don't specifically recall who said it) is never just a simple one of pecuniary motive, but results from a willingness to alter the moral relationship between an individual and his work. Unintentionally, we have become very ordinary.

The operational definitions that give form to our citadel are so commonly extant we hardly give them a thought. Our criteria guide us to "thorough professional competence," "creative performance" and "extraordinary ability," with either no statement of how to judge whether we have become lost along the way, or practices that "count" the signposts of evidence or, worse, statements and practices that are simply inbreds of the criteria, themselves, and thus capable only of incestuous judgment.

Even then we give ourselves comfortable "outs." Tenure decisions, for example, can be based upon "potential for contributing significantly . . . " (underline mine) and are not to be made in consideration of the institutional costs of such decisions. Recognizing the legitimacy of colleague judgments, we form committees (advisory or otherwise) where the categorical "who"

represented (there shall be eleven members of the Committee, five of whom shall be . . .) is more important than the quality of that representation in decisions made. We seldom even ask whether any categorical representation has any meaning beyond learning what we have distorted.

Individuals whose time has come have the "responsibility" to present a portfolio case for themselves and the "right" to appear before their reviewers. But judgments "should not be influenced by the candidate's failure to comply" (with a request), even those required for appropriate judgment (I assume). Favorable judgments of a candidate's qualifications should not only be "affirmative" but "enthusiastically so" and made without the "slightest reservation." At best such exhortations are tempermentally unsuited to University policies. At worse, they represent a recondite "clucking."

There are other forms in the citadel now. The younger among us feel closed off by the diminished choices of our steady state enterprise. They may well resent those of us who came to our stations during the "fat years," who might not have made it at all under today's restraints and who receive significantly higher salaries than they do for no harder work. That we "paid our dues" even we do not fully believe -- nor do they.

The trustees and managers of our citadel grumble about being over-tenured, imitate the management techniques of alien enterprises and the skills of the consumate hustler and seek to convince the supporting citizenry that we are quite tidy in our affairs despite what they have heard and read. Coupled with low mobility (low may be an overstatement), junior and senior faculty alike must survive in place (with a second income to be sure) and seek that survival in the very security clauses (now collectively negotiated by someone who "represents us") that allowed the defaulting citadel to rise in the first place.

In addition to the alternative of "riding out" our present state, an alternative I personnally reject but which may in fact be our predominant response, there are a number of other alternatives. That there are is evidence that despite the state of affairs I have incompletely described, there are as there always have been, individuals and institutions that

never fully succumbed to the acid of our times or to a merely passable response.

Rummaging About the Edges

When I was a young high school student I was impressed by the fame that seemed to follow an individual's ability to formulate a law -- Boyle's law, for example. (I didn't know, then, that such fame was found only in textbooks.) After much thought that might have been better directed, I framed a law: "If you play with something long enough, it will break." No one seemed to care then, or now, about my achievement. But I exact it now. If we rummage about our personnel policies enough and play with the pieces enough, some of them will break and that will be a start -- the only start some of us may be capable of making.

I do not mean to downgrade such a start. We begin where we can. But the effort is limited to doing better what we presently do. We have models from our experience to guide us -- substitution and alteration change models. We substitute one textbook or reading list for another, develop substitute course materials, "try out" team teaching, or alter required courses. (We do not give up books, reading lists or required courses.) In each instance the intention is to improve what we do. While such changes are relatively safe they are changes nevertheless. Applied to personnel policies, what might be the form of such changes?

We could, for example, change the basis for determining representative participation in personnel decisions while retaining the concept itself. Instead of quota representation by professorial rank, we could have representation by declared point of view, regardless of rank or tenure status, on the assumption it is the belief systems of individuals, freely expressed, and not their rank and status that form their judgments. We would seldom have unanimity as a result, but I doubt the validity of unanimity in determining the appropriateness of talent for a complex enterprise.

We would give more procedural autonomy to schools and colleges than we now generally do while retaining institutional-wide personnel policies. I have never been convinced that the institution (the University) needs to detail procedures for its schools and colleges.

We could grant more freedom of choice to the individual being considered, not only in selecting primary areas for judgment, but also in selecting a colleague advocate. Interests of the department, school or college and the University can be protected (and must be) against professorial narrow self-interest by establishing minimum standards.

We could become more clear in our statements of criteria and in their associated assessments. For example, instead of "scholarly productivity" and "referred journals" we could develop criteria and standards for professional writing, for research efforts and for training and retraining projects, grants or otherwise. (I dislike the term "training." I use it, here, because it has common currency.) In so doing we would set parameters within which we could freshly approach the matter of standards. Our typical "scholarly productivity" is too vague a criteria and our "referred journal" too narrow a standard. In this last, we may well lose the arbitrary distinctions between oral and written, internally and externally directed publications. That, in itself, would be no small achievement. I have never been able to fully appreciate why in personnel decisions we grant considerable favor to an article, let's say, in the Harvard Educational Review (thoughtful and well-written) and very little if any favor to a curriculum guide for freshman English (also thoughtful and well-written) even when the impact of the former is limited to its publication and an occasional "letter to" while the impact of the latter changed a departmental offering that affected hundreds of students.

In becoming more clear in our intentions, we may also finally rid ourselves of such pseudo aphorisms as "released time," a concept which assumes (or defines) normal work from which we need to be "released" to do other work not defined as normal. We have the bizarre situation of being "released half-time" to "do research" (never mind the silly language) even though personnel policies expect research productivity in the faculty role. The mix of elements (teaching, research, course and curriculum development, advisement, professional service, etc.) in a faculty role should vary over time according to individual and institutional needs and should not be subject to plea bargaining.

Hopefully, these examples have served to make the point that modest change in our personnel policies and procedures is possible now, is preferable to waiting for orders, and a better survival guarantee than is the status quo.

The Seduction in a Search For a Center That Will Hold

For some members of the Senate the foregoing may be too opuscule and for others not sufficiently compelling to avoid a secondary reaction that may come at the hands of others as financial realities continue to bear upon the University.

We can be seduced at every turn in our search for ways to make better personnel judgments. We know, as George Fasel has written, that we in the university society live in a "rule bound culture of public law, internal by-laws, political pressures, and ancient customs and usage, where lawyers are ready to put precisely too fine a point on just about anything."

We know that "right" choices are illusive, sometimes thinly disguised in their catering to popular taste, and we feel defenseless against our own temptation to see our affairs as ineffable and to renounce any personal responsibility for what happens as a result.

We know that our university world can be looked at as simply being there -- simply a collection of things and ME. A ME, just there too, "hanging around so to speak, waiting for something to happen, but expecting that nothing will," as Robert Starratt has written.

Yet, we do want to behave in a manner that will not corrode the best among us and allow the second-rate to prosper. We know we have a right to expect more of ourselves than that.

It is mendacious, really, to deny the civil religion of practical salvation and to believe in an encounter with a miracle. Except, that much of what we believe is self-seduction and the miracle we encounter is our own integrity. So the search for a center that will hold must proceed.

There is no one way to begin. The intention, however, is to change what we do and not simply to do better what it is we do. I offer some possibilities for consideration. (For what follows I freely acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues at this University and elsewhere. I also acknowledge that

there is nothing "unheard of" in what I propose. Lastly, I acknowledge that my loss of innocence in these matters may be nothing more than madness.)

Institutional Definitions. The University as an institution needs to establish the objectives toward which its personnel are to direct their efforts, to make such objectives publicly evident and to provide the resources necessary to meet those objectives.

In the absence of such public objectives, individuals in the University may become more interested in the general academic life with prime allegiance external to the institution. In their absence, too, suspicion and hostility are nurtured in personnel actions with individuals often feeling they have fallen into the darkness of some kind of judgmental (but secret) cesspool. Without appropriate resources, however, any set of publicly evident institutional objectives is futile and fraudulent. The promise is to be kept.

Discretionary Judgment. In a personnel document of a neighboring institution there is the statement that "human judgment is an essential part" of a performance review process. I make the point that professional judgment is the performance review process. There is no set of data or procedure for gathering it and no review process that can substitute for our professional judgment as our documents and our practices appear to indicate. Being involved in such judgments, therefore, is a matter of a quid pro quo contribution. It is not an assumption of a right, representative or otherwise. Professional judgment is exercised out of a backlog of experiential history that becomes more than any one piece of that history. The way in which evidence is put together and the judgments of that evidence are the hallmark of the professional. Representativeness that disregards (as I believe our practices do) the contribution to be made to the judgment of competence, is a washout.

Having stated this, I need to back away from it a bit. The individual under review must be involved in that decision and should have some choice in who the others to be involved will be, whether or not the individual's judgment is skilled and rationally exercised and whether or not the emotional loadings of such judgment is effectively accommodated. To do otherwise would be an inhuman practice.

Colleague judgments can never be dismissed. The academic life is more than a choice of careers. It is a choice of a way to live and that way has intellectual and ethical requirements that are properly the concern of the collegial community.

The institution's administrators must be involved -- some of them. In a university the academic administrator is a double agent, serving as an agent of the very faculty he is supposed to evaluate as the agent of the university. (Double agents have a touch of glamour about them, but seldom much nobility.) If an academic administrator is incapable of consistent, sound judgment, termination of that administrator would alone improve personnel practices in the institution. But the position of the academic administrator in the process is not removed from that process.

Areas for Judgment. There is much common agreement among institutions of higher education on what properly constitutes the areas within which competence is to be judged. The following listing, therefore, is not atypical.

Classroom Teaching

Professional Writing
- -- for internal publication
- -- for external publication

Research

Departmental Activities
- -- student advisement and programming
- -- program development (including so-called training grants)
- -- colleague responsibilities
- -- management tasks

School/College/University Non-Teaching Activities

Professional Association Activities

A listing of areas cannot stand as given because of the questions it raises. Are all areas of equal importance? Are judgments to be made in all areas all the time? For all faculty?

For my part, the listed areas are not equal. Classroom teaching, writing and research are primary and the remainder important but secondary. For example, an individual should not be able to substitute competence (or dedicated effort) in student advisement, committee work and management tasks for

lack of competence in teaching or writing or research. If (example again) one needs the services of a physician, a nurse is not a proper substitute. Nor is a laboratory technician. This in no way makes less valuable the contributions of nurses and laboratory technicians. It does mean that the professor should be judged as a professor and not as something else no matter how valuable the "something else" is.

There are important qualifiers to the foregoing. Minimum standards is one qualifier. Judgment as a professor is another. Thus, no individual can demonstrably exclude teaching, professional writing and research from consideration over a career though the balance among these primary areas should vary over time.

"Earned" variance is another. By that I mean individuals develop and demonstrate and receive recognition for marked contributions in some area which earns them the variance. Those who have not done so cannot legitimately make the same claim.

At least two things have been left unsaid in this discussion though both may have been implicit. Secondary areas should not be of major importance in personnel decisions for the professorial ranks. In a real sense, at the upper ranks an individual earns the right to be inadequate in secondary areas.

Also implicit is the possibility that some individuals will not be able to rise above minimum standards or even reach such standards. In both instances there will be those who nevertheless cannot be severed from the University without doing damage to the individual, the University and those which both serve. For the former, lower-level rank should be the limitation. For the latter, no professorial rank is warranted. The time to differentiate faculty is long past.

Criteria (standards) For Judged Areas. At the outset I need to make clear how the terms criteria and standards are being used in this memo since they are generally synonymous terms. I use the term criteria because it has currency and the term standards to avoid using what I consider more awkward terms, such as criterion-measure, standard of measurement or competency indicator. I use criteria as a description of what something should be and standard as the indicator of that something. Criteria are the desired qualities;

standards the yardstick. (In doing so I may without intention affront those whose professional qualifications in measurement and evaluation greatly exceed my own. These individuals are free to substitute their more precise language as the need comes upon them.)

Personnel documents generally understate criteria and typically avoid explication of standards through the application of which judgments can be made of the qualifications of individual faculty. That both situations prevail is only partly explained by the real difficulties in doing otherwise. Those difficulties cannot be overcome if we do not begin somewhere to overcome them. There is a reluctance to begin. For one thing, we might fail. For a second, we might succeed and that success then requires commitments we do not now have to make. For a third, we can all think of legitimate exceptions to almost any criterion or standard that might be established. (Our documents, now, include such qualifiers as "normally," "except under unusual circumstances," "as a rule," and others.) Last, we expect announced criteria and standards to be equally applied "for the record" when for the "actual" record we "fudge" consistently.

We might begin by establishing criteria that are possible to judge through standards that are possible to exact. We will not have a fully free choice for some competencies are required in the faculty role (teaching, for example). But we do not require "exemplary teaching" or a "distinguished reputation" unless we can also state what we mean by both and how we will know if either or both has been demonstrated. And we do not require that faculty be judged in areas over which they have little or no control. Professional association activities, for example, cannot have as a criterion "serving on important regional or national committees." An individual faculty member has little control over such selection.

We can develop principal criteria and minimum standards for initial retention that are applied equally to all during a defined probationary period not necessarily the same as the present probationary period for purposes of tenure decisions. Beyond retention criteria and standards, we can establish additional sets for continuation and for each of the professorial ranks. These sets, however, should not be applied equally, individual to individual, college to college. Beyond minimum criteria and standards

the University aborts its own purposes if it demands uniformity. The quality of an institution's efforts is largely expressed through the demonstrated abilities of its personnel. It is self-defeating to seek to diminish differences among faculty and punitive to deny the expression of unique abilities, interests and background.

What constitutes a competency profile beyond minimum criteria and standards should be a deliberately negotiated matter between the individual and the school/college administration with appropriate university administrators serving as consulting negotiators and colleagues as necessary "friends in court."

Two ways come to mind as a basis for making judgments of this inequality. One way is to discount some area from judgment for different individuals during a specified period of time depending upon individual, department and college needs. Another is to provide the opportunity for the individual, the department and the college to assign degrees of importance (weights) to all areas that also would vary individual by individual.

Uniform ways of gathering data and guidelines for using it can be established. For classroom teaching, for example, official documents would be used such as course objectives, activities, and evaluations. Student evaluations could be required extending over a period of time and including indications of the manner in which such evaluations were used (or not used). Self-statements (evaluations) could be included and the teaching behavior of the individual professor could be formally observed by those who will be involved in the judgment of that teaching. In this last statement I do dismiss out of hand (without apology) the objections to such observation that center on how badly we would do it if we did it or those that propose that "personal taste" is the criterion for Art of which teaching is assumed to be a form. We may be the only professionals whose professional acts are performed in the absence of other professionals. If we are to make judgments of those "acts" we must have a measure of judgment that goes beyond (but does not exclude) self-judgment and beyond (but also does not exclude) the judgments of those who are defined as students in the process.

Guidelines for such data gathering should be holistic so as to guard against distortion and consequent prejudice. Empirical and intuitive

methodologies and qualitative phenomena and quantitative properties should be included.

Professional Equity Compact: The Gold Watch is History

A simple truth in the abstract is that if we had a human climate of mutual understanding, respect and common agreement ("My handshake is my word") on what the life of a professor is to be we would have no need for the kinds of rules, regulations and prescriptions that now give form to our university lives. If we do not have such a climate and no will for it, no set of regulations will give it birth.

This abstraction, however, must be seen in the light of our humanness. Because we do not live in an ideal world (and in our less than ideal world our spirit is often being "nibbled to death" as Stephan Bailey has written), we in our best moments seek to develop those policies that protect us in our worst moments. Some definition of what we are about is necessary for we are weak as well as strong, irratic as well as stable, irrational as well as rational, and are not excused from the temptations that rest uneasily everywhere. But we should choose the most minimum of rules and regulations to govern our personnel matters, to avoid as much as possible intrusions into the affairs of schools and colleges and maximize every opportunity for the individual to exercise talents within the objectives and goals of the institution.

There is a risk, but it is less of a risk than being subjected to the view of a professional life as a programmed text. If we embrace that view, we become mere raw material to be molded into the form of an academic journeyman.

One suggestion for putting together what has been stated so far in this memo is to develop what I am defining as a Professional Equity Compact -- a formal document for each individual faculty member (tenured or not) that is a statement of the rights, responsibilities, privileges, obligations, objectives, focused interests -- whatever referents are thought to be important for the individual and the institution (hence equity and compact) to be in force for evaluation purposes for a targeted period of time. The operational details of such an Equity Compact would proceed from at least the following claims upon it:

1. Rights and responsibilities of the institution. Since the services of faculty are performed through and made possible by the institution, the institution has the right and the responsibility to evaluate that service. It does so through the development of publicly evident minimum criteria and standards, through its academic administrators, through a bare minimum of rules and regulations, through an unwavering accounting of stewardship, and through a pledge of resources necessary to the objectives for which faculty are to be held accountable.

2. Rights and responsibilities of a school or college. A school or college has the right to determine how its collective conscience will be exercised in personnel matters, what constitutes criteria and standards beyond minimums and the responsibility to make both determinations evident.

3. Rights and responsibilities of the individual. The individual has the right to a free exercise of talent, to a determination of areas and levels of contribution (beyond the minimums of school or college and the institution) to a shared choice of who will be involved in judgments of competence and to a choice of what is to be risked (or not) in his/her career at the University.

The individual has the responsibility to meet school/college and institutional requirements and to carry out the tasks in the Equity Compact.

For these three claims, alone, it is clear that some synergy must take place. The development of a compatible diversity among faculty and between schools and colleges is always an uneasy fusion of separate expectations responsive to (but not subject to) continuing pressures.

4. Negotiated referents. In each Equity Compact there will be negotiated referents that vary individual to individual, time period to time period. Length of the Compact may be one such referent. (One-year appointments should be abolished. They simply are not reasonable in terms of faculty opportunity to demonstrate a level of competence or for judgments to be made of that demonstration. For those that fear "being stuck with" someone, I suggest that is a matter of initial selection.)

What areas are to be judged, what criteria level is the goal, who is to be involved in those judgments, what resources are necessary to the plan,

how evidence will be gathered, are among other possible negotiated referents that can be anticipated. The Equity Compact, however, should also make explicit those negotiated referents that may not be typical and which may represent a form of calculated risk. For example, assume that criteria have been established for promotion from assistant to associate professor for each of the areas previously listed, particularly the primary areas. Individuals should have the opportunity to negotiate an Equity Compact that provides for a certain level of demonstration in some area and a disregard of another. An individual "risks" not meeting some of the criteria for promotion (in this example) by a decision to demonstrate extraordinary accomplishment in another. The individual has a right to such risk behavior. The institution the obligation to honor it. Both, the responsibility for judging the results.

5. Non-negotiated referents and exclusions. The Equity Compact should also include which referents of a faculty role are non-negotiable or are to be excluded from the Compact. These exclusions in the Compact are necessary to protect the individual from unwarranted practices and to protect the institution as well.

Minimum criteria and standards for retention, for example, would be a non-negotiated referent. A particular teaching load for any part of the Compact term might be another. The instructional requirements of a department, for example, for a particular semester might be such that an individual professor for that semester has a teaching load not entirely compatible with the objectives of the Compact. Such a circumstance should be noted to protect the professor against misjudgments of this exception in the context of the Compact as a whole.

Some individuals to be involved in personnel decisions may also be non-negotiable -- school and university academic officers, for example, or a university-wide colleague committee for tenure decisions.

Exclusions would include such referents as salary as not endemic to the concept of the Compact.

6. An institutional record. The Professional Equity Compact is fundamentally a personal plan for professional growth directed toward the

goals and objectives of the institution and carrying its approval and support. The personal side (individual work aspirations) does not represent the kind of privacy requiring protection from the view of others. The opposite is really true, in my judgment, since such a plan makes evident the desire of faculty to improve competence and the institution to judge it (that, alone, may silence some of our critics) is important to share with colleagues for information, decision-making and the refinement of ideas and provides specific information on faculty goals and expectations important to institutional planning. There is no embarrassment or loss of dignity in a Professional Equity Compact being an accessible university record.

An Arguable Concluding Comment

There is fundamentally no safe way in which a university can proceed in matters of personnel judgments. As more uniformity is sought in policies, more precision in statements of criteria and standards, more regulation of practices and how decisions are to be made, there will be a gain in an important efficiency index and, most likely, in institutional definitions of fairness. There is the consequent risk, however, of diminished adaptiveness necessary to being responsive to the combined demands of a changing climate and an insistent tradition.

As efforts are directed toward maximizing ability authority, as I believe they must be, and reducing the importance of bureaucratic and status authority, the adaptability-response of the institution will be improved through making more possible the full utilization of individual talent. But there will be consequent unevenness and the potentially upsetting temporariness that accompanies false starts.

In the extreme both positions are damaging. The former because of its fertile ground for the insensitive manager. The latter because of the ease of turning freedom and dedication into license and fanaticism. I have argued for neither extreme in this memo. I fear that as we are pressed from all quarters with no quarter seemingly capable of even a thin blanket of professional comfort, the extreme response will appear among us, its siren-song richly disguised.

In "Send in the Clowns" from A Little Night Music, there is the passage:

> Isn't it rich,
> isn't it queer,
> losing my timing
> this late in my career?
> And where are the clowns?
> There ought to be clowns.
> Well, maybe next year.

I never fail to be saddened by the bittersweet tone of this passage as I relate it particularly to the academic community and its fragile framework of consensus and respect that can be damaged by disenchantment alone. I do believe our timing is off. I do believe it is late in our careers. There are very few clowns to help us laugh at ourselves through parodies of what we pretend to be. There are, I think, too many harsh jesters who only mirror our own self-portraits and lull us into the comfort of "maybe next year." It is a small deception, perhaps, but a cruel one nevertheless.

H. Philippi
May 1979